

Federal Highway Administration

[FHWA Docket No. FHWA-98-4370]

**TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (TEA-21);
IMPLEMENTATION FOR THE TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY AND
SYSTEM PRESERVATION PILOT PROGRAM**

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice; request for applications for Fiscal Year (FY) 2000 Transportation and Community and System Preservation (TCSP) grants; request for FY 2000 TCSP research proposals; request for comments on program implementation and research needs.

SUMMARY: This document provides guidance on section 1221 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), which established the Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program. The TCSP provides funding for grants and research to investigate and address the relationship between transportation and community and system preservation. The States, local governments, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and other local and regional public agencies are eligible for discretionary grants to plan and implement transportation strategies which improve the efficiency of the transportation system, reduce environmental impacts of transportation, reduce the need for costly future public infrastructure investments, ensure efficient access to jobs, services and centers of trade, and examine development patterns and identify strategies to encourage private sector development patterns which achieve these goals. FY 2000 is the second year of the TCSP pilot program.

Through the TCSP, the States, local governments, MPOs, and other public agencies will develop, implement and evaluate current preservation practices and activities that support these practices, as well as develop new, innovative approaches to meet the purposes of the TCSP grant program (see section II in preamble). Funding for

the TCSP was authorized at \$25 million per year for FY's 2000 through 2003 by TEA-21. The Administration's FY 2000 budget proposes to increase the funding for TCSP to \$50 million as part of the President's Livability Initiative. The FHWA seeks requests for FY 2000 TCSP grants, proposals for FY 2000 TCSP research, and public comments from all interested parties regarding implementation of the TCSP program and research related to the program in FY 2001 and beyond.

DATES: Requests for FY 2000 grants should be received in the appropriate FHWA Division office by July 15, 1999. Proposals for FY 2000 TCSP research should be received in the FHWA Office of Planning and Environment by September 15, 1999. Comments on program implementation, research needs, and priorities should be received by the DOT Docket Clerk on or before July 15, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Grant requests should be submitted to the FHWA Division Office in the State of the applicant. Division addresses and telephone numbers are provided in an attachment to this notice. Research proposals should be submitted to the Office of Human Environment, Planning and Environment, Federal Highway Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590.

Your signed, written comments on program implementation should refer to FHWA Docket No. 98-4370 appearing at the top of this notice and you should submit the comments to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. All comments received will be available for examination at the above address between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of comments should include a self-addressed, stamped envelope or postcard.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan B. Petty, Office of Human Environment, Planning and Environment, (HEHE), (202)366-0106; or S. Reid Alsop, Office of the Chief Counsel, HCC-31, (202)366-1371; Federal Highway Administration, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington D.C. 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

Internet users may access all comments received by the U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL-401, by using the universal resource locator (URL): <http://dms.dot.gov>. It is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. Please follow the instructions online for more information and help.

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded using a modem and suitable communications software from the Government Printing Office's Electronic Bulletin Board Service at (202)512-1661. Internet users may reach the **Federal Register's** home page at: <http://www.nara.gov/fedreg> and the Government Printing Office's database at: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara>. Information is also available on the FHWA Web page: (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/programs.html>).

Background

Section 1221 of the TEA-21 (Pub. L. 105-178, 112 Stat. 107 (1998)) established the TCSP. The Department of Transportation's Strategic Plan (1997-2003) includes a series of goals related to safety, mobility and access, economic growth and trade, enhancement of communities and the natural environment, and national security. The TCSP pilot program furthers each of these goals and provides funding for grants and research to investigate and address the relationship between transportation and community and system preservation. By funding innovative activities at the neighborhood, local, metropolitan, regional, and State levels, the program is intended to increase the knowledge of the costs and benefits of different approaches to integrating transportation investments, community preservation, land development patterns and environmental protection. It will enable communities to investigate and address important relationships among these many factors.

This notice includes three sections: Section I – Program Background and Information of Implementation of TCSP in FY 1999; Section II – Requests for FY 2000

TCSP Grants; and Section III – Requests for FY 2000 TCSP Research Proposals.

SECTION I: PROGRAM BACKGROUND AND IMPLEMENTATION OF TCSP IN FY 1999

Introduction

The TCSP provides funding for grants and research to investigate and address the relationship between transportation and community and system preservation. States, local governments and MPOs are eligible for discretionary grants to plan and implement strategies which improve the efficiency of the transportation system, reduce environmental impacts of transportation, reduce the need for costly future public infrastructure investments, ensure efficient access to jobs, services and centers of trade, and examine development patterns and identify strategies to encourage private sector development patterns which achieve these goals. Through the TCSP, States, local governments, and MPOs implement and evaluate current preservation practices and activities that support these practices, as well as develop new and innovative approaches. FY 2000 is the second year of the TCSP program.

The TCSP supports high priority goals of the administration for transportation systems to foster sustainable communities and minimize greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global climate change. Transportation systems interact with built, social and natural systems to produce short and long term environmental, social equity and economic results. The TCSP strengthens these inter-relationships between transportation plans, strategies and investments and community development and preservation to help create sustainable communities. Within the context of sustainable communities, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector is one focus for the TCSP.

FY 1999 TCSP Program Implementation Process

The DOT established this program in cooperation with other Federal agencies, State, regional, and local governments. The FHWA is administering this program and has

established a working group with representatives from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), the Research and Special Programs Administration/Volpe Center (RSPA), the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (OST), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The working group prepared the initial design and implementation of this program. In the first year of the program, the working group gathered input through a **Federal Register** notice (under FHWA Docket No. 98-4370) (September 16, 1998, 63 FR 49632) and through meetings with stakeholders conducted as part of DOT's outreach activities following the passage of the TEA-21.

In FY 1999, the FHWA received more than 520 Letters of Intent requesting TCSP funding. These requests totaled almost \$400 million and were received from agencies in 49 States and the District of Columbia. To review and evaluate the Letters of Intent, the FHWA established a review process which included review and comments from the field staff of the FHWA, the FTA, and the EPA as well as a 20-person review panel comprised of technical program experts representing the agencies participating in the working group described above. The review panel recommended to the FHWA Administrator the applicants that were asked to develop full proposals for further consideration. A similar panel reviewed the full proposals. Information on the review process is included below.

On April 26, 1999, the FHWA announced the award of 35 TCSP grants for FY 1999. Grants were awarded to 28 States and the District of Columbia. A list of the grants awarded in FY 1999 and a brief description of each proposal are included under Attachment I to this notice.

Summary of Comments to the Docket

The September 16, 1998, **Federal Register** notice (63 FR 49632) requested comments on TCSP program implementation in FY 2000 and beyond. Letters from the following organizations were submitted to the docket (FHWA-1998-4370):

American Public Transit Association (APTA)

Metro (Portland, Oregon)

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (San Francisco, California)

Missouri Department of Natural Resources

Montana Department of Transportation

NAHB Research Center

National Association of Home Builders

New York State Thruway Authority

The Trust for Public Land

Washington State Department of Transportation

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Most of these letters included several comments. Some comments responded directly to questions posed in the September 16, 1998, **Federal Register** notice, while some comments expressed other perspectives and concerns. Comments that respond to a question posed in the **Federal Register** notice have been presented in items numbered one through six in this section. Other comments have been grouped to provide a logical presentation and avoid repetition and are included under items numbered 7 through 10 in this section. Many of the comments received were extensive, and have been paraphrased. The complete docket may be viewed at the locations provided under the captions ADDRESSES and Electronic Access in this preamble.

1. **Project Selection Criteria.** The FHWA asked whether there should be any additional weight or priority applied to any of the criteria for FY 2000 and beyond; and whether additional criteria for proposal evaluation should be added.

Comments: Several commenters offered suggestions for factors that should be considered when evaluating TCSP proposals, including: Evidence that the applicant can effectively complete the project in a timely manner; whether the results could be replicated both locally and nationally (i.e., avoid projects that are unique to local circumstances); projects that have a high likelihood of success; and planning proposals

that would lead to implementation activities. A commenter also suggested that TCSP proposals should be selected based on how well they help answer key research questions and data uncertainties. This commenter also proposed that the overall project selection could be balanced using an “Experimental Design” that provides a mix of different types of projects that focus on each of the key research issues.

One commenter proposed that TCSP applications should be given priority based on their ability to demonstrate: Adopted regional and local policies that show a commitment to linking transportation investments with land use development; a commitment to State growth management requirements (such as having urban growth boundaries); and substantial financial commitment to local transportation investments that support alternative modes of travel and environmentally sensitive land use development. Another commenter suggested that program eligibility should require that proposals clearly address the link between land use and transportation in the preservation of the viability and effectiveness of the transportation system and the community it serves. This commenter argued that the TCSP program criteria and guidance, as currently written, would allow activities with no relation to this land use/transportation link. While supporting these points, another commenter added that the role transit can play in land use considerations should also be emphasized in program guidance.

A commenter proposed that implementation grants in regions pursuing a consistent set of mutually supportive policies should be given higher priority and areas pursuing conflicting policies should receive lower priority. The following example was given for a high priority implementation grant: projects reinforcing established urban growth boundaries, which would prevent “leapfrog” development and the need to build additional highway capacity. An example of a lower priority project would be in an area that proposes a transit-based development project while simultaneously building new highway capacity in the same corridor without a planning study demonstrating that these actions are consistent.

Similar perspectives were offered by commenters who said that implementation grants should be awarded in areas demonstrating an understanding of the “land use/transportation link” and are currently applying that understanding towards transportation system and community preservation. These commenters proposed that priority be given to areas that have demonstrated a strong commitment to these principles through planning, public outreach, adoption of supportive land use regulations, and commitment of Federal, State, and local funding to these activities.

Response: We concur with the comments made regarding factors that should be considered. With the intense competition during the first round of the Letters of Intent (LOIs) review, the workgroup focused on proposals that could begin immediately upon selection, where the sponsor appeared to have the resources to produce a successful project, and those LOIs that would produce results, tools, and lessons that would be transferrable to other areas.

Language clarifying the distinction between planning grants and implementation grants has been added to this notice. The FHWA will continue to rely on input from the FHWA, the FTA, and the EPA field offices to address concerns about the “lower priority” project described by the commenter in this item number 1. This type of concern also underscores the importance of funding only those activities that are consistent with the Statewide or metropolitan planning processes (see item number 2, "Planning").

The FHWA has added information in this notice about the types of projects that were selected, grant and research themes for consideration, and abstracts of the selected grants. It is the intent of this pilot program to fund activities which address the interaction of transportation and community and system preservation. The FHWA believes that effectively linking land use and transportation planning is a principle strategy to be investigated under TCSP. However, the FHWA is also interested in pursuing other strategies that should also be developed and evaluated under TCSP.

2. **Planning.** The FHWA asked how it can ensure that TCSP-funded activities

support the existing statewide and metropolitan planning process. How can the FHWA support innovative activities, integrate new planning techniques and refocus the planning process to ensure TCSP-related activities are addressed? What is the best way for local governments and non-traditional partners to coordinate with the State and metropolitan planning process?

Comments: In general, there was strong support that TCSP proposals should be consistent with and supported by statewide and metropolitan planning processes. However, several commenters expressed concern that the TCSP pilot could circumvent the existing statewide and metropolitan planning processes, and proposed that the FHWA should require all LOIs to include written confirmation or a letter of support from the applicable State or MPO that the proposed project is consistent with the statewide or metropolitan planning process. One commenter contrasted the TCSP pilot to other discretionary programs (e.g., Access to Jobs) that explicitly require coordination with the metropolitan planning process.

Regarding the involvement of non-traditional partners, one commenter suggested that letters of support from these partners should be required as part of the LOI. A similar comment was made that a demonstration should be made that all appropriate parties are involved, including affected governments and transportation agencies, as well as neighborhood, business, environmental, and social interest groups.

One commenter said that it is appropriate in the first year of the pilot program to award grants for projects which have not been included in the metropolitan or statewide transportation improvement program (23 CFR Part 450), and went on to say that beyond the first year, projects should be part of the metropolitan transportation planning process before an LOI is submitted. This commenter suggested that to meet the Transportation Improvement Plan(TIP)/State TIP fiscal constraint requirement, the TIP/STIP could note that the project is conditioned upon DOT's approval of the project, but establish the area's commitment to the project. Otherwise, this commenter added, including the

project in the TIP/STIP becomes a pro forma activity with the decision to support the project coming from the Federal rather than the local level.

Two commenters supported using TCSP grants for a stand-alone phase of a multi-phased project that has already been partially funded.

Response: Section II of this preamble, “Relationship of the TCSP to the Transportation Planning Process,” describes the FHWA’s commitment to the transportation planning process that was established by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) (Pub. L. 102-240, 105 Stat. 1914 (1991)). Generally, the LOIs demonstrated coordination with the appropriate State DOTs, MPOs, and transit providers in the text of the LOI and some submitted letters of support. Also, input from the FHWA, the FTA, and the EPA’s field offices was specifically sought on this topic because these offices are familiar with metropolitan and statewide planning processes and practices. This notice did not require States or MPOs to act as “clearinghouses” for LOIs, but rather encouraged coordination and partnerships. The **Federal Register** notice for FY 2000 continues to emphasize that the TCSP pilot should support statewide and metropolitan planning processes. In addition, the notice encourages TCSP applicants to notify the appropriate State DOT and MPO of their application to further promote this coordination. Future reviews of full grant applications will continue to look for evidence of this support.

As one commenter suggested, TCSP projects could be included in a TIP/STIP for informational purposes. If the applicant is successful in receiving funds through the competitive process, the project could then be formally incorporated into the TIP/STIP. In general, projects should not be included in the TIP/STIP as a pro forma activity, but should reflect consistency with the appropriate regional or statewide long-range transportation plan, which has been developed in accordance with the requirements in the planning rule (23 CFR part 450). A single phase of a multi-phased project would be eligible for TCSP funds if the project meets the appropriate criteria. However, as noted

in the FY 1999 Federal Register notice, TCSP funds are intended to fund new and innovative activities, and not to be applied towards routine or ongoing activities that would otherwise be undertaken by the State or MPO.

3. **Grants.** The FHWA asked how it can ensure improvements to a single location, neighborhood street, or job center provide meaningful community preservation impacts on the larger region. How should the FHWA balance grant-making between planning and implementation grants? Should there be a cap on the size of grants? Should land acquisition and right-of-way purchases be funded?

Comments: One commenter proposed that initially there should be no fixed percentage between grants to localities that are new to community preservation practices (referred to as planning grants in the FY 99 program) and those localities that have already implemented some of these practices (referred to as implementation grants in the FY 1999 program) and research, but early in the TCSP program, higher priority should be placed on research and evaluation in the first three years and equal weight on start-up and on-going grantees. In comparison, two commenters advocated that there be no cap on grants or a specific split between planning and implementation activities, but recognized that given the available funds, a large grant request may not be feasible. Another commenter supported a mix of grants, but recommended that most of the TCSP funds should be used for grantees that are already involved in community preservation activities since the greatest benefits of the TCSP program will come from the demonstration of actual practices.

Another commenter said that proposals for grantees already involved in community preservation practices should demonstrate that prior public information and involvement has occurred with all potentially affected parties and that the project has already been approved by the appropriate MPO. In addition to public involvement, proposals for larger grants should also be able to demonstrate by analysis of data and forecasts the expected impact of the project on the region and perform a benefit and cost

analysis that quantifies all expected impacts.

Four commenters stated that land acquisition and right-of-way purchases should be eligible for funding. One commenter clarified that with the high cost of these types of activities the DOT should make certain that they meet all of the TCSP criteria.

Response: Rather than setting specific limits on the types of grantees, the FHWA will continue to seek a range of proposals, which would take into consideration the category of grantee, type of project, geographic location, population served, and urban/suburban/ rural mix. One immediate goal of the pilot is to fund activities that will provide demonstrable results, be instructive to future applicants and contribute to the body of knowledge regarding the relationship between transportation and community and system preservation. The FHWA will also consider the percentage of grantees that are new to community preservation and those that have already begun some of these practices. The FHWA will use the results of evaluations of individual projects and research to set priorities for the program in the future. Because it is too early in the program for these results, in FY 2000, the FHWA is not setting specific priorities but offers suggestions of new areas to consider (see “Strategic Priorities” in Section II of this preamble).

While research is an important component of the TCSP program, the FHWA disagrees with the comment that a majority of TCSP funds should be used for research, rather than for grant activities. All over the country, States, MPOs, local governments, and their partners are engaged in, or are planning to begin activities consistent with the TCSP objectives. The FHWA intends to use the available TCSP funds for grantees to test, evaluate, and share these activities. In addition, because TCSP requires evaluation and measurable results from grants, the individual projects will further the knowledge base on community preservation practices. As discussed under item number 5 in this section evaluation is an important component of each successful grant. Since the FHWA is interested in increasing the knowledge base, producing tools, and lessons which can be

replicated across the country, projects which would produce quantitative data and forecasts (including benefit and cost analyses) would be reviewed favorably.

Public involvement is a high priority in the TCSP pilot and is a fundamental component of the metropolitan and statewide planning process. To the extent that TCSP proposals implement or are linked to the transportation planning process, these proposals should receive adequate public involvement (including the involvement of non-traditional partners). The involvement and participation of non-traditional partners was a priority for all grants that were submitted in FY 1999.

Right-of-way and land acquisition are currently eligible activities within the context of a project or program that meets the TCSP criteria. As stand-alone activities, they would still need to meet the appropriate criteria.

4. **Project Timeliness.** The FHWA asked how important the time line should be for implementation of projects in evaluation of proposals.

Comments: Some commenters thought timeliness was a very important consideration in grant selections, while others thought it should not be a primary concern. One commenter replied that timeliness of grants to States, local governments, and MPOs that have already initiated community preservation programs and policies is less important than for other applicants because public involvement and benefits and costs may have already been estimated in a prior planning study. The commenter also stated that timing is less important for grantees that are just beginning preservation practices since a primary purpose of TCSP planning grants is to provide the opportunity for “learning by doing” through integration of transportation, land use, community development, and environmental planning. In comparison, another commenter stated that timing is important for grants to recipients that have not yet initiated community preservation programs and policies. A third commenter stated that timely implementation is very important and should be used as a mandatory criterion for the program, adding that grant awards should only be made if results are available to impact

the next transportation authorization bill in 2003. Another commenter agreed that timely implementation should be used as a mandatory criterion for the program, and that awards should only be made if the grantee can show it is ready to implement the project in the year the grant is made.

Response: The FHWA agrees with the commenters that timeliness of the projects is important and should be a consideration in grant selection. The FHWA will look at the applicant's ability to carry out the TCSP proposal in a timely fashion and produce results that could be shared nationally.

5. Evaluation of Projects. The FHWA asked how project sponsors can effectively evaluate the results of activities. How can the results of individual project evaluations be used to evaluate the overall impacts of TCSP?

Comments: One commenter responded that collecting the appropriate data and analyzing complex relationships for evaluation purposes can be expensive, and that the level of resources devoted to evaluation will vary depending on the type of project. At a minimum, the desired results of the project should be defined in terms of travel behavior, land use, and community design and amenities. A means of measuring whether these results have been achieved should be included in the evaluation plan. A recommendation was made that a certain percentage of projects be evaluated by an independent party, preferably by an academic institution, adding that since the funding for research and evaluation is limited, it may be useful to focus these activities at a few centers, with each center specializing on one specific type of project or research issue. Two other commenters proposed that the FHWA contract with independent groups or non-profit associations to assess the results of the program, and to inform the reauthorization process in 2003.

Another commenter was concerned about the TCSP's emphasis on performance measures because this is an area of much debate and practical examples are difficult to identify and implement. This commenter stated that the major focus of the TCSP

program should be on achieving the primary objectives for which the program was created and not directing a disproportionate share of limited TCSP funds to measuring outcomes, adding that project evaluation will be determined in part by the objectives of a particular project which may be difficult to measure with quantitative measures or analytical procedures. Ultimately, this commenter argued, the first few years of the program will reveal how projects can be deemed successful or not.

Response: The FHWA agrees with the commenters above which stated that evaluation was very important to TCSP. The FHWA is working with the DOT's Volpe National Transportation Systems Center and an independent consulting firm to evaluate the TCSP program, during the time frame of TEA-21. Furthermore, detailed guidance on evaluating individual grants has been provided to FY 1999 TCSP grantees and is electronically available on the website www.fhwa.dot.gov. The FHWA does not anticipate that an appropriate project evaluation would use a significant portion of project funding.

Since the TCSP program is a discretionary pilot that seeks to encourage innovation and new strategies that go beyond traditional transportation programs, it is incumbent on the FHWA to ensure that appropriate evaluations are conducted to determine the effectiveness of the strategies tested. Measurements should be reasonable based on the objectives of the project and the need to inform future proposals and funding decisions. The FHWA agrees that evaluation should be appropriate and meaningful for guiding future funding decisions and increasing our knowledge base about the interaction of transportation and community and system preservation. The TCSP is a small pilot program to develop new, effective strategies that can then be used through regular transportation and land use programs. It is not intended to implement preservation activities nationwide. Therefore, the evaluation of strategies tested under TCSP is a principle outcome of the TCSP activities.

6. **Research.** The FHWA asked what gaps currently exist in our knowledge of

transportation and community preservation practices. What experience—both good and bad— do we have with work in this field? What tools do practitioners need to achieve the integration of these issues in the transportation planning process and in project implementation?

Comments: One commenter noted that by reducing the cost of living and working outside central cities, U.S. investment in urban and rural interstate highways has been a major influence on the growth of suburbs and low density residential development. As urban population and congestion has grown, transportation investment has improved access to the suburbs, which in turn has encouraged decentralized, sometimes specialized, employment sub-centers. More is known about the impact of transportation investment on land use than the impact of land use patterns on transportation modes. This commenter also added that for a variety of reasons, continued transportation investment in new highway capacity, subsidizing alternative modes, zoning/growth management, and neotraditional planning have been the major policy approaches that have been adopted or pursued. There are very few examples where such programs have been in place long enough to determine cause-effect relationships. Nor have appropriate data always been gathered to develop solid estimates and forecasts of the impact of specific policies. This commenter said the TCSP program is an excellent opportunity to conduct research that would begin to determine the cause-effect relationships of these investments and policy approaches, and proposed the following research questions:

(a) What specific factors cause some people to leave cities and the suburbs to live in the rural fringe when simultaneously other persons choose to relocate in renewed urban areas to take advantage of urban amenities?

(b) Is there a “self-selection” bias that needs to be accounted for in evaluating the relationship between population densities, urban form, and transportation behavior? Is the apparent average travel time of approximately one hour per day masking the real

differences in travel time that is occurring? What are the impacts of current congestion management and environmental protection policies on travel?

(c) The rule of thumb is that commute times to work have remained roughly unchanged over time at about 20-25 minutes. Are people adjusting their lifestyles to maintain relatively constant travel times? Similarly, do people have a roughly constant “travel time budget” of roughly one hour per day for all travel, or is it different, in different geographic regions? If so, how important is it to relieve congestion? Is there an opportunity to lay the foundation to identify differences in “travel time budgets” in different regions of the U.S.? What are the characteristics of those who travel less (or more) than these apparent constants?

(d) The intent of urban growth boundaries is to encourage high densities and minimize urban/suburban sprawl. In some instances, this strategy to contain urban sprawl is being weakened by smaller urbanized areas (within one hour commuting) seeking economic development in their jurisdiction. In what circumstances is this desirable? What are effective policies to limit undesirable outcomes. What opportunities are there to correct mispricing?

One commenter found that the FY 1999 **Federal Register** notice placed an emphasis on urban growth boundaries as a growth management tool, but argued that the successes of this tool are limited, and at best not very well understood. This commenter felt that analyses of the relationship among urban growth boundaries, highway planning, mass transit approaches, and housing affordability are needed before more real-world experimentation with this tool is conducted, and encouraged the FHWA to devote a significant portion of TCSP funds to research the effectiveness of land use control policies such as urban growth boundaries. This commenter urged the FHWA to direct TCSP funding toward evaluating current land use-air quality models and creating new models, as well as the relationship between highway expansion, land development patterns, and air quality.

Response: The FHWA agrees with the commenters that there is much to be learned about how to create livable communities. In Section II of this preamble on strategic priorities and research for the FY 2000 TCSP, the FHWA requests grants and research to begin to address these questions.

7. Eligible Grant Recipients.

Comments: One commenter encouraged the FHWA to allow non-governmental entities to apply for implementation grants to provide maximum flexibility to this new program. Another commenter said that given the intent of the TCSP program (to address the relationship between transportation and community and system preservation) it is important that all entities with responsibility for the transportation system be eligible to receive funding. This commenter recommended that toll authorities and agencies be added to the list of eligible recipients for this program particularly since toll authorities provide transportation services that would be provided by the department of transportation in another State.

Response: Eligible grant recipients were established by section 1221 of TEA-21. The September 16, 1998, **Federal Register** notice further clarified the legislative language by providing the following examples of units of local government: Towns, cities, public transit agencies, air resources boards, school boards, and park districts. If the toll authority is recognized by the State as a unit of local government, then it is an eligible recipient for TCSP grant funds. Non-governmental entities are encouraged to form partnerships with eligible grant recipients as the project sponsor.

8. Local Matching Funds/Use of Other Federal Funds.

Comments: One commenter observed that although the program encourages local matching funds, there is no requirement for a local match. This commenter advocated that local communities would take more ownership of projects that require a firm match of funds generated at the community level, and suggested a mandatory match ratio of 10 to 20 percent of local funds, with a related 80 to 90 percent of Federal funds.

According to this commenter, the local match could come from local or statewide nonprofit groups or local, regional, or State governmental entities. Other commenters supported a local match requirement, and added that investment of other Federal funds (including transportation funds authorized under TEA-21, as well as Federal grants for Housing and Clean Water) would also demonstrate local commitment.

Response: The September 16, 1998, **Federal Register** notice, under “Priorities for all Grants” stated that applications for grants will be evaluated, among other factors, on a demonstrated commitment of non-Federal resources. As the commenter correctly stated, matching funds were not required. However, TEA-21 directs the Secretary to give priority to applicants that demonstrate a commitment of non-Federal resources to the proposed project. The FHWA agrees that providing local matching funds demonstrates a stronger commitment at the local level. In response to the comment regarding the use of Federal funds to demonstrate local commitment, the FHWA also considers this to be a demonstration of commitment. A number of successful TCSP applicants in FY 1999 combined grant resources from other FHWA, FTA, EPA and the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) programs to support an innovative project. However, since the TCSP funds are intended to be used for innovative activities, we did not review favorably proposals that could be funded with other traditional sources of funds.

9. Urban Versus Rural Emphasis.

Comments: One commenter found that the FY 1999 **Federal Register** notice showed a bias toward larger metropolitan areas, noting that smaller metropolitan areas are under growth pressures and could also benefit from the TCSP pilot program. The suggestion was made that the next solicitation for projects should use a broader range of examples of potential projects to include both rural and small metropolitan areas. In contrast, another commenter suggested that the TCSP program should focus on urban areas, because those areas experience the most intense pressure involving land use, transportation and community preservation.

Response: The TCSP program is applicable in a wide variety of settings where communities are trying to address the integration of transportation and community and system preservation, and that TCSP funds are equally applicable in urban, suburban, and rural areas. As noted in this preamble, the FHWA will continue to seek a range of proposals, which would take into consideration the type of project, geographic location, and a mix of urban, suburban, and rural settings.

10. Federal Involvement in Local Land Use Actions.

Comments: One commenter claimed that through the TCSP program, the FHWA is engaging in local land uses issues where historically local governments and the electorate have made decisions. This commenter expressed concern that the TCSP pilot would provide a precedent by providing Federal funds to governmental entities and non-governmental groups to develop and adopt certain land use policies and restrictions.

Response: The FHWA has no intention of using the TCSP pilot to involve itself in local land use decisions. The FHWA is interested in promoting and funding sound, yet innovative planning that simultaneously considers transportation and community and system preservation in the long-term. The FHWA strongly supports the statewide and metropolitan planning process that was created by the ISTEA, and relies on States and MPOs to use these processes, agency partnerships, and public involvement activities to identify proposals that would be eligible for TCSP funds.

11. Review Process.

Comments: One commenter strongly supported a joint review and approval process by the FHWA and the FTA.

Response: An interagency work group comprised of the FHWA, the FTA, the FRA, the OST, the RSPA, and the EPA has reviewed all of the FY 1999 letters of intent and full grant applications for the TCSP pilot. Participation has occurred at the field level (Regional and Division/State offices) as well as from each agency's headquarters office. Final decisions have been made by the FHWA Administrator based on the

recommendations of this coordinated, interagency partnership.

Information from the Technical Review Panel

A 20-person panel including technical program experts in highway, transit, environment, railroad and planning reviewed the FY 1999 Letters of Intent and grant proposals for TCSP. The feedback from the interdisciplinary experts that participated on the review panel on the FY 1999 TCSP applications will be helpful to those developing proposals for FY 2000. The panel used the criteria that were established in section 1221 of TEA-21 and included in the **Federal Register** notice (September 16, 1998, 63 FR 49632). In addition, the panel looked for innovative strategies to meet the TCSP goals and geographic and population diversity to include proposals to address urban, suburban, rural, and disadvantaged populations. The panel noted that the more than 520 LOI's submitted were worthwhile projects but that because of funding limitations, it was

necessary to identify only a very small number that best met the purposes of the pilot program. The following information from the panel discussions may be helpful to those applicants that were not selected in FY 1999, as well as for those applying in FY 2000:

(a) **Purposes of the TCSP:** Section 1221 of TEA-21 identifies five purposes for TCSP projects. The purposes are broad and include transportation efficiency, environment, access to jobs, services, and centers of trade, efficient use of existing infrastructure, and land development patterns. A key element of TCSP is exploring the link between transportation and land development patterns. The panel looked for innovative approaches that would test and evaluate the effectiveness of integrating land use planning and transportation planning to meet the purposes of TCSP. The panel looked for proposals that were developed to specifically address each of these. In some cases, a proposal would indicate that if congestion were reduced that would also increase access to jobs planned in the future. The panel looked for more proactive solutions, such as, working with agencies and the private sector organizations involved in employment

and jobs to assure that the transportation system would meet the needs for access to jobs. Similarly, on environmental issues, some applications limited the potential impacts of their proposal to air quality issues rather than addressing broader human and natural environmental issues such as watersheds, ecosystems, habitat fragmentation, and community and cultural impacts.

(b) **Innovation:** The TCSP is a small pilot program that is developing and testing new strategies that can be used by State and local agencies nationwide in their ongoing transportation programs. Funding in TCSP is not intended to implement community preservation practices nationwide, but to pilot test new approaches. As a pilot program, TCSP is an opportunity for agencies to support and encourage non-traditional approaches. Therefore, it may be appropriate to request TCSP to support a smaller innovative portion of a larger project that can be funded under other transportation funding. This may also help to increase the local matching share committed to the project which is also a factor in project selection. In addition, leveraging other Federal funds (e.g., EPA, HUD, or other highway and transit funding) as part of a larger project will also demonstrate local commitment to the project.

The review panel recognized that what is innovative in one area may not be innovative in another area and considered this in the evaluation. This is consistent with the legislation which seeks to encourage community preservation practices in areas that have not done this before as well as to reward and encourage localities that propose expanding on already successfully implemented preservation practices.

(c) **Evaluation and Results:** The evaluation component of TCSP projects needs to demonstrate the expected results of the proposed activities and measure the outcomes. This is critical for this pilot program so that other communities can learn from and apply the lessons learned. Therefore, clearly stating the objectives of the projects and activities and the anticipated results were important in successful proposals. In addition, successful proposals included a schedule of major milestones for the project. If the project was a

planning study, the application demonstrated the likelihood that the results or recommendations of the study will be implemented, by whom and when.

(d) **Partnerships:** The TCSP encourages public and private participation in proposed projects. In addition, TCSP encourages including non-traditional partners on the project team. The type and scope of the project will determine the best mix of partners and whether these should include members of the general public, as well as environmental, community, business, and other groups. The roles and functions of the partners should also be explained. For example, are these groups to be surveyed or educated or will representatives of these groups serve on the project team or on an advisory group?

FY 1999 TCSP Grant Awards

The activities and research funded under the TCSP program will develop, implement and evaluate transportation strategies that support transportation and community and system preservation practices. The program will demonstrate transportation strategies that incorporate the short- and long-term environmental, economic, and social equity effects to help build sustainable communities. Examples of preservation strategies being developed by TCSP grantees in the first year of the program include transportation initiatives which: integrate land use and transportation planning; balance economic growth, environment and community values; create a long range vision for a community or region; reuse existing infrastructure to meet the purposes of TCSP; develop urban, suburban and rural strategies for communities; and establish non-traditional partnerships to meet TCSP goals. Attachment I to this notice lists the grants selected for TCSP funding in FY 1999 and includes a brief abstract of each project.

SECTION II: REQUESTS FOR FY 2000 TCSP GRANTS

Introduction

The grants and research funded under the TCSP program will develop, implement and evaluate transportation strategies that support transportation and community and system preservation practices. The program will demonstrate transportation strategies that incorporate beneficial short- and long-term environmental, economic, and social equity effects to help build sustainable communities.

TCSP is included in the President's Livability Initiative. This initiative strengthens current Federal programs, proposes new ones to help create livable communities, and includes programs in the EPA, the HUD, the Department of Interior (DOI), the Department of Justice (DOJ) and other agencies in addition to the DOT (see <http://www.whitehouse.gov/CEQ/011499.html>). Within the DOT, the Livability Initiative will help ease traffic congestion and promote community livability through a 15 percent proposed increase for several DOT programs that provide flexible support to State and local efforts to improve transportation and land use planning, strengthen existing transportation systems, and promote broader use of alternative modes of transportation. The Administration's Livability Agenda includes increased funding for mass transit, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), Transportation Enhancements, and TCSP. The TCSP pilot program in FY 2000 is proposed to increase from \$25 million authorized under TEA-21 to \$50 million.

In FY 1999, the FHWA used a two-step procedure to solicit and select TCSP proposals. Applicants were first requested to submit brief LOIs. The FHWA selected a small number of applicants based on these LOIs to prepare full grant requests for further consideration. After the review of the full grant request, 35 proposals from agencies in 28 States were selected to receive TCSP funds. In FY 2000, the FHWA has changed this procedure and is using a one-step process. The FHWA is no longer asking for LOI, but only a grant request. From the grants submitted on July 15, 1999, the FHWA will select those funded in October, 1999.

With almost \$400 million requested in FY 1999, competition for these funds is

expected to remain high. Grants may be spent over a period of up to two years but no commitment can be made for second or subsequent years of grant awards. Thus, phased projects should stand alone and be capable of being implemented and producing results in each phase. A sample outline and format for FY 2000 TCSP grant requests is provided in Attachment II to this notice.

Eligible Recipients

State agencies, metropolitan planning organizations and units of local governments that are recognized by a State are eligible recipients of TCSP grant funds. This would include towns, cities, public transit agencies, air resources boards, school boards, and park districts but not neighborhood groups or developers. While non-governmental organizations are not eligible to receive TCSP funds under section 1221 of TEA-21, these organizations that have projects they wish to see funded under this program are encouraged to form partnerships with an eligible recipient as the project sponsor.

States or MPOs may be both a project sponsor and endorse other activities proposed and submitted by a local government within its boundary. A State or MPO may consider packaging related activities for submittal as one larger grant request.

Purposes of the TCSP Grant Program

Activities funded under TCSP should address and integrate each of the purposes of the program listed below. Priority will be given to those proposals which most clearly and comprehensively meet and integrate the purposes and are most likely to produce successful results. How well proposed projects achieve each of these purposes will be a principal criterion in selecting proposals for funding. Applicants should develop proposals that specifically address these purposes. Grant proposals should address how proposed activities will meet and integrate all of the following:

1. Improve the efficiency of the transportation system.

Proposals for TCSP activities should identify, develop and evaluate new strategies and

measures of transportation efficiency that are based on maximizing the use of existing community infrastructure, such as highways, railroads, transit systems and the built environment. Proposals should address the transportation system as a whole rather than focusing on one mode of transportation. This may include for example, improving the integration of various modes of travel such as highway, transit, pedestrian, bicycling, and rail or improving the efficiency of port, rail and highway connections for freight and jobs. Performance measures should include a focus on movement of people and goods and access rather than movement of automobiles, and on services provided rather than vehicle miles traveled.

2. Reduce the impacts of transportation on the environment.

Proposals for TCSP activities should explore the long-term direct and indirect social, economic and environmental impacts of transportation investments on the natural and built environment. Consideration of environmental factors should not be limited to air quality but should also address, if appropriate, ecosystems, habitat fragmentation, water quality as well as community and cultural issues such as disadvantaged populations and environmental justice. Performance measures should relate the results of TCSP activities to the larger community and regional environment and the transportation system.

3. Reduce the need for costly future public infrastructure.

Proposals for TCSP activities should describe how they will reduce the need for costly future public infrastructure investment or create tools and techniques to measure these savings over the life cycle of the activities. Performance measures should include projected life cycle savings obtained through avoiding future investments or maintenance.

4. Ensure efficient access to jobs, services and centers of trade.

Proposals for TCSP activities should clearly demonstrate how they improve efficient, affordable access to jobs, services and centers of trade and address benefits for

disadvantaged populations. This could also include the use of new technologies that increase access for people and businesses while reducing the need to travel. Performance measures should include improved access to jobs and services, and improved freight movements.

5. Encourage private sector development patterns.

Proposals for TCSP activities should identify and test effective strategies to encourage private sector investments that result in land development patterns that help meet the goals of this pilot program. Effectively linking land use and transportation is a key feature of TCSP. Performance measures should demonstrate and monitor changes in development patterns and private sector investment trends or opportunities resulting from TCSP-related activities.

Priorities for selection of grants

In addition to meeting the purposes of TEA-21 discussed earlier in this preamble, applications for grants will be evaluated based on the following factors:

a. A demonstrated commitment of non-Federal resources. Although matching funds are not required, priority will be given to projects which leverage non-Federal funds and take advantage of in-kind contributions such as maintenance agreements, land donations and volunteer time. The contribution of local funds and resources for a project demonstrates local commitment to a project and increases the likelihood that it will be fully implemented. In addition to non-Federal funds, grantees are encouraged to pursue other Federal resources to support Livability Initiatives such as Transportation Enhancement, Congestion Management and Air Quality funds, as well as HUD, EPA, DOI and other programs. A description of the President's Livability Initiative can be found on the White House Web site (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/CEQ/011499.html>) and click on "Virtual Library."

b. An evaluation component. The plans to evaluate the project's objectives and outcomes is a key element of the grant proposal. The evaluation plan should include

major milestones and deliverables for the project. See the discussion on Evaluation in this section.

c. An equitable distribution of grants with respect to a diversity of populations.

The FHWA will also be ensuring the equitable distribution of funds to geographic regions, including an appropriate mix of rural, suburban and urban activities. Applicants should describe the populations that will be served by the project, including disadvantaged populations.

d. Demonstrated commitment to public and private involvement including the participation of non-traditional partners in the project team. Such partners might include public utility operators, social services agencies, community groups, environmental organizations, non-profit organizations, public health agencies, private land development organizations and real estate investors. The TCSP also envisions non-traditional partners working on the project team and help develop the assumptions and scenarios. This approach would be broader than public involvement processes where transportation professionals prepare projects, scenarios and assumptions and present these in public forums for review and comment. In the proposal, applicants should describe the role and commitments of their partners.

Category of Grantee

The TCSP was intended to support localities which have already begun some preservation practices and to encourage those areas that are just starting. The legislation referred to grants to these types of grantees as implementation grants and planning grants, respectively. These terms proved to be confusing to applicants in FY 1999 because they are common terms used in transportation projects. Many interpreted the terms to describe the activities conducted under a specific grant proposal rather than describing the community preservation activities of the grantee. Therefore, in FY 2000 the FHWA is asking grant applicants to identify themselves as either: (a) grantees that are just beginning to start community preservation practices, or (b) grantees that have already

initiated transportation related community preservation programs and policies. This later category would include grantees who have coordinated with State and locally adopted preservation and development plans; integrated transportation and community and system preservation practices; promoted investments in transportation infrastructure and transportation activities that minimize adverse environmental impacts and lower total life cycle costs; or encouraged private sector investments and innovative strategies that address the purposes of the TCSP program.

Eligible Activities

Activities eligible for TCSP funding include activities eligible for Federal highway and transit funding (title 23, U.S.C., or Chapter 53 of title 49, U.S.C.) or other activities determined by the Secretary to be appropriate. This allows a broad range of transportation activities to be funded. Grants will be awarded for new and innovative transportation activities that meet the purposes of the TCSP program, but remain unfunded under the current Federal-aid program.

Strategic Priorities for FY 2000 TCSP

Grants will be awarded for activities that meet the purposes of the program described above and are innovative. The goal of the TCSP is to develop a broad range of strategies for urban, suburban and rural communities to help promote liveable communities through transportation investments and operations. The legislative language that created TCSP is general and provides States, MPOs and local agencies flexibility to create innovative approaches to addressing the goals. As the program evolves over the next four years, the FHWA will use individual project evaluations conducted by grantees, the results of research, and overall program evaluation to determine the strategic priorities for TCSP. This information is not yet available since this is the first year of the program and grants were just recently awarded. Therefore, in the second year of the program, rather than setting specific strategic priorities, the FHWA is providing information on the proposals funded in FY 1999 and several suggestions to prospective

applicants of areas

that are of interest to the FHWA. The FHWA continues to seek additional strategies that are innovative and can be replicated by others. Applicants should highlight innovative and unique aspects of their proposals, and how the results of their proposal will further the purposes of the TCSP.

Examples of preservation strategies being developed by TCSP grantees in the first year of the program include transportation initiatives which: Integrate land use and transportation planning; balance economic growth, environment and community values; create a long range vision for a community or region; reuse existing infrastructure to meet the purposes of TCSP; develop urban, suburban and rural strategies for communities; and establish non-traditional partnerships to meet TCSP goals. A common theme in the proposals was that the objectives were to use transportation solutions in unique ways to help to meet long-term community goals rather than to only address current mobility needs. Applicants should not seek to duplicate the strategies being evaluated in FY 1999 unless there is a significant change in the scope, application, or results of the strategy.

The FHWA is also interested in proposals which measure the results and broad impacts on communities of current preservation practices including urban growth boundaries, infill development, and land use changes. This suggestion is also included in the request for research proposals below as an opportunity for an independent assessment of the outcomes of current preservation practices. Other areas that may be considered include integrating community health and safety goals with transportation to promote livable communities; planning or implementing regional and local strategies to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions; using technology and communications that provide people and businesses with improved access to goods and services to promote livable communities; and enhancing intermodal and freight access to promote economic growth and access to jobs in communities.

The FHWA is particularly interested in supporting projects that are ready to begin

and have plans to collect and document results that can be shared with others quickly and successfully. The proposal should highlight when the proposal would be initiated and when results are expected.

Evaluation

Every proposal funded under the grant program should include a description of the applicant's plans for monitoring, evaluation and analysis of the grant activity, and for providing the results of this analysis to the FHWA. This information is necessary to provide an opportunity for the DOT, States, MPOs, and local governments to learn more about the practical implications of integrating land development, transportation, and environmental decisionmaking. The grant request may include funding for travel for one representative to attend two national workshops to present the plans, status, and results of the project.

The measures used to evaluate project results should be based on the goals and objectives of the project. In addition to individual project evaluations, an overall program evaluation will be conducted by the FHWA under the research component of the program described in Section III of this notice.

Developing measures to determine the results of the projects is difficult and there is no general consensus on operative measures. A resource guide on program evaluation for TCSP projects is available on the FHWA Web page

(<http://tcsp-hwa.volpe.dot.gov/index.html>). Methods to measure and evaluate current and future performance may include, for example:

1. Quantitative assessments such as measurement of changes in traffic flow and mode choice (e.g., increased pedestrian and bicycle traffic), environmental impacts and reduced vehicle miles of travel or number of trips;
2. Analytic procedures which forecast the current and future impacts of projects, such as, travel demand, land development, or economic forecasting; or
3. Qualitative assessment, such as, interviews, surveys, changes in local

ordinances, or other anecdotal evidence.

Relationship of the TCSP to the Transportation Planning Process

The TCSP will complement, improve and enhance the Statewide and MPO planning process created by the ISTEA, and refined by TEA-21. This process promotes the ongoing, cooperative and active involvement of the public, transportation providers, public interest groups, and State, metropolitan and local government agencies in the development of statewide and metropolitan transportation plans and improvement programs (23 CFR part 450).

Grant proposals should clearly demonstrate the coordination and consistency with appropriate statewide and metropolitan transportation planning processes. TCSP applicants are encouraged to notify the appropriate State DOT and MPO of their application to ensure this coordination. In addition, the FHWA will post the list of FY 2000 applications and titles of the proposals on its Web site as soon as it is available.

The DOT fully supports this planning process, which has brought diverse constituencies and government agencies together, and views the TCSP activities as a logical step in the continuing improvement of transportation planning at the State and regional level. The TCSP can help broaden the scope and impact of the planning process to better integrate land development planning, environmental goals and objectives, economic development, social equity considerations, and other private sector activities. The integration of interest groups, investors and developers through partnering with government applicants is a goal of the program. The TCSP activities also consider incorporation of much longer planning horizons and consider the impacts on future generations.

Activities funded by this program may be used to test or implement new, innovative planning methods and programs that significantly enhance the existing statewide and MPO transportation planning processes. The TCSP funds are intended to leverage new transportation and community preservation initiatives rather than to fund

the ongoing planning activities of States and MPOs. The TCSP-funded activities should demonstrate coordination with the State or MPO to ensure the planning process is not circumvented. In addition, activities should encourage and improve public involvement in the overall planning process as well as in the individual project.

Construction projects funded by the TCSP will ultimately be included in an approved State or MPO TIP. The TCSP funds should not be requested for projects that have already been scheduled for funding and are in the current State or MPO TIP. Highway and transit projects which either use Federal funds or require Federal approvals, and are in air quality nonattainment or maintenance areas, should be included in an air quality conformity analysis required as part of the transportation planning process. Because TCSP projects may target improved air quality as part of their broader goals, documentation of the beneficial air quality impacts of the project will be important.

Non-construction activities funded by the TCSP, such as the development of regional plans and policies, project evaluations and land development code changes, may not need to appear in a statewide or MPO TIP, but should still have the support or endorsement of the State or MPO. Planning activities funded by TCSP should be reflected in the metropolitan area's Unified Planning Work Program. Non-construction activities may result in changes to existing State and MPO plans and, therefore, need coordination with other jurisdictions within a metropolitan region or State.

Schedule and Administrative Processes for FY 2000 Applications

There are several options for the administration of grants under TCSP. The FHWA has established financial management systems with the State Departments of Transportation and anticipates that most TCSP grants will be channeled through this established process. However, if another process such as a cooperative agreement or grant through another eligible agency (e.g., a public transit agency) is preferred, the applicant can work with the appropriate FHWA Division Office to develop a different funding mechanism.

An applicant should send four (4) printed copies and a diskette with a file (optional, as described in Attachment II of this notice) of the TCSP grant request to the FHWA Division Office in the State in which the project is located by July 15, 1999. Applicants should note that the FHWA is not requesting the 4-page LOI's that were used for the FY 1999 selection process. The FHWA will use input from field staff and an interagency technical review panel similar to the process used in FY 1999 to evaluate proposals that will be funded. Questions about the grant program should be directed to the FHWA Division Office in the State in which the applicant is located. The time line for FY 2000 applications for TCSP and a proposed time line for FY 2000 follows:

FY 2000 TIME LINE FOR TCSP

TCSP Milestones	FY 2000
Issue Federal Register Notice Request for FY 2000 Grants, Research proposals, and comments	May 1999
Grant requests and comments due to FHWA Division Offices	July 15, 1999
Research proposals due to FHWA	September 15, 1999
Grants awarded	October 1999
Research projects awarded	January 2000

SECTION III: REQUESTS FOR FY 2000 TCSP RESEARCH PROPOSALS

Introduction

The TCSP includes a comprehensive research program to investigate the relationships between transportation, community preservation, and the environment, and to investigate the role of the private sector in shaping such relationships. The research program also includes monitoring, evaluation, and analysis of projects carried out under the grant program.

Program Evaluation and Outreach

Program and project evaluation is an important part of the TCSP. To meet the purposes of the pilot program and develop strategies and methodologies that can be used by localities, measurable results and a means to disseminate this information are needed. In addition to the evaluation of each project conducted by the grantee, the FHWA will conduct an overall program evaluation combining the results of the grants and the research program to help set the strategic direction and future priorities for the TCSP. An important measure for the success of TCSP is the extent to which the results and best practices from the pilot program are used effectively by government agencies, the private sector, and others.

Under the research component of TCSP, the FHWA will establish outreach, technical assistance, and other means to share and implement the results elsewhere. Current outreach plans include **Federal Register** notices, the grant workshop, the FHWA web site information, and participation in other conferences and meetings.

Research Program

The goal of the research program is to build a knowledge base of work in this field that will enable State, regional and local government agencies, the private sector and neighborhood groups, through transportation activities, to help shape sustainable communities that meet current and long-term environmental, social equity, and economic goals. With coordination and input from its partners and stakeholders, the FHWA will identify and initiate needed research to support the purposes of the TCSP. The research program is integral to the TCSP, and it will support and complement the activities conducted through planning and implementation grants. Likewise, applied research activities that may be a part of a grant activity would be beneficial to the research program.

This notice requests comments and suggestions on the research program and also solicits specific research proposals. The FHWA anticipates that most of the TCSP funds will be allocated for grants and that limited funding will be available for research. The

FHWA is soliciting comments on the research needs to support the TCSP and will initiate TCSP research to meet the needs that are identified. In addition to FHWA conducted research under the TCSP, the FHWA is soliciting research proposals for consideration in funding in FY 2000. The research may be conducted through cooperative agreements with organizations, contract support, or through State, local, and MPO grants.

The FHWA emphasizes that it anticipates that very limited funds will be available for research in FY 2000. The FHWA proposes to solicit research proposals that address the following areas:

1. Evaluation of results of current community preservation practices. Information is needed on the specific outcomes of current statewide, regional, and local community preservation practices, such as, green corridors, smart growth, urban growth boundaries, higher density development, and land use controls to improve transportation efficiency. Research should include both costs and benefits of these initiatives and performance measures.

2. The FHWA is seeking research on the development of needed tools and methodologies to support decision makers. Transportation-related tools and analytical techniques will be enhanced to help support the State and local decision makers in taking a longer term view and balancing economic, social equity, and environmental goals.

ATTACHMENT I: FY 1999 TCSP GRANT

Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARIES

Alaska

01: Municipality of Anchorage: “Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (AMATS) Community Transportation Cooperative”\$250,000

Re-design the public involvement program by determining the most effective processes and technology to empower the public, to facilitate communication, and to motivate the community to engage in meaningful dialogue in land use and transportation issues. Apply the new program to

the Ship Creek Multimodal Transportation Plan, an area with controversial land use /transportation/ community preservation issues located adjacent to the downtown Anchorage Central Business District.

Arizona

05: City of Tempe: “Transit Overlay District and University Drive Subarea Study/Integrated Transportation Plan, Model, and Local Transit-Oriented Design Guidelines” \$225,000

Complete the community-driven elements of the comprehensive transportation and land use plan.

Activities include:

- 👉 A transportation subarea study and implementation plan for University Drive that will coordinate neighborhood goals to narrow/traffic calm the street while identifying strategies to combat a range of area transportation issues with an approach that emphasizes both non-SOV transportation and community redevelopment.
- 👉 Creating a transit-oriented overlay district model, which can be supported by neighborhoods and the development community. Implement on University Drive and in the NewTown service area. Apply to other parts of Tempe and communities.

California

13: San Francisco Planning Department: “Land Use Support for the Mission Street Transit \$177,000

Develop a plan for transit-oriented development in the Mission Street Transit Corridor and its diverse mix of mostly medium- and low-income residents, who depend on transit for journey-to-work trips. Prepare a transit-oriented land use plan for the Balboa Park Station at the southern end of the corridor and use as a model for how transit-oriented development can increase the city’s share of new mixed-use residential and commercial development, how it can strengthen land use and transit links, how it can increase transit use, how it can encourage

mixed-use residential and commercial infill sensitive to neighborhoods, how it can refocus the city's neighborhoods towards transit and away from the automobile, and how it can ease some of the burdens placed on private-sector development.

45: City of Escalon: “Escalon High School Linkage Project” \$150,000

Link the community high school with a variety of land uses via two separate alternative transportation corridors: 1) The Southern Link - A pedestrian plaza, roadside park and *woonerf* on a portion of SR-120 abandoned as a result of highway realignment; and 2) The Northern Link - A Class-I bicycle lane along Miller Avenue providing a direct link between the high school and community center and a bicycle/pedestrian activated crossing signal. Mitigate the impacts associated with the widen roadways. Populations benefitting from the project include both students and senior citizens.

64: Mono County: “Lee Vining Community Planning Project” \$182,000

Create a consensus-driven vision to provide transportation and land-use planning guidance to a small town that serves as a main gateway to Yosemite National Park. Identify the community's role in balancing the need for tourism with the preservation of community character and quality of life. Balance the multiple needs and users who depend on a major state highway facility serving as a local Main Street. Identify mitigation opportunities for seasonal traffic impacts in and around the park, focusing on the proper integration of the YARTS with Lee Vining and other communities bordering the park. Provide a model for intergovernmental cooperation and public involvement for unincorporated rural areas struggling with transportation and land-use issues.

Connecticut

01: Hartford Metropolitan Area: “Picture It Better Together: Taking Transportation Goals \$480,000

Examine the links between transportation, land use, and economic development at both the neighborhood and regional level by researching sustainable development practices informed by

local and regional perspectives. Identify traditional forms of circulation and land use patterns in three prototypical communities—one urban, one suburban, and one rural— then plan for integrative patterns of development in each. Research and form best development practices, business incentives, and public/private support for these strategies at the regional level and facilitate discussions about regional interdependence. Develop human-scaled land use designs at the neighborhood level to integrate multiple transport modes and address traffic conflicts.

District of Columbia

01: Metropolitan Washington Region: “Implement Adopted Transportation Vision for the Metropolitan Washington: Develop Circulation Systems and Green Space” \$380,000

Implement two key components of the region transportation vision: 1) improvements of circulation systems within the regional core and regional activity centers and 2) integration of green space into a regional greenways system. Involve key agencies, officials, and stakeholders and identify financial resources for project implementation. Design comprehensive regional programs which identify priority projects for implementation and encourage the inclusion of these projects into the region's Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Florida

05: Gainesville Metropolitan Area: “Develop and Apply Integrated Land Use and Transportation Sketch Planning Methods” \$150,000

Develop sketch planning methods and simple model refinements to better estimate the effects of various land use, non- motorized transportation and transit strategies on travel choices and behavior. Develop analytical methods to post-process certain outputs of the traditional four-step travel demand forecasting process to better represent the land use-transportation connection. The goal is not methodological elegance but rather ease of use and improved predictive power. Activity addresses all modes of travel, particularly as they relate to different land use

characteristics within the metropolitan area.

Idaho

01: Ada/Canyon Counties: “Treasure Valley Futures: New Choices for the American West”

\$510,000

Develop an education process which defines barriers to attaining these goals and identifies a range of alternative choices for policy implementation that can be incorporated directly into the existing land use and transportation policy framework. The project should result in an increase in the number of policy decisions being made by agencies and other groups supporting local and regional objectives. The project approach is designed to work within the Treasure Valley's fragmented political framework and deeply held beliefs concerning private property rights.

Kentucky

01: Central Bluegrass Region: “An Integrated Model for Transportation Planning and

\$435,000

Produce two linked products that will aid in realizing and attaining TCSP goals. Provide innovative guidance and strategies to aid communities in reconciling development pressures with the need for livable communities through the Corridor Master Planning Handbook. Detail the fusion of visualization software with group facilitation and decision techniques for purposes of promoting consensus across a diverse community regarding roadway improvements through the Visualization Guide. These tools will address local planning questions that arise from regional concerns and aid in understanding the link between them. The project focuses on the development challenges found in the historic Bluegrass Region of Kentucky and involves both traditional and non-traditional partners.

Louisiana

01: New Orleans Metropolitan Area: “Transportation/Community Systems Optimization through Non-Traditional Partnering and Infrastructure Prioritization” \$450,000

Develop and implement various mechanisms to affect land use growth factors and system tools in order to guide transportation development, community and system preservation and regional metropolitan sprawl. Traditional tools and non- traditional approaches will be employed. Develop regional strategies and tools leading to a long-range plan and a map of growth/sprawl boundaries for a regional livability standard based on balance and sustainability. Develop a capital project management plan for the effective and efficient timing and construction of transportation

infrastructure, and establish a framework for the control and monitoring of regional metropolitan sprawl. Form coalitions of interest groups in the region to realize the level of knowledgeable voter tax support to implement sustainable land use and transportation growth measures.

Maryland

04: State of Maryland: “Maryland Integrating Transportation & Smart Growth (MINTS)”

\$450,000

Use integrated Smart Growth and transportation planning strategies to: maintain and enhance existing communities and contribute to their quality of life and economic vitality; demonstrate how investments in transportation strategies can encourage well planned growth where it is desired and discourage new development where it is inconsistent with Smart Growth objectives; and use sound growth management to facilitate community conservation, preservation of infrastructure capacity, and "smart" transportation strategies. The project will be carried out in 2 - 3 locations representing two distinct growth-management settings: 1) an urban community with challenges to improve the efficiency of the existing transportation system, to conserve the community, and to prompt re-development and infill development and 2) in exurban and suburban areas with sprawling development patterns which threaten rural resource protection goals, generate highway and other infrastructure needs, and environmental and transportation system efficiency issues.

Michigan

05: Saginaw Metropolitan Area: “Retrofitting Anytown, USA” \$48,000

Conduct a public design charrette to look at retrofitting two intersecting suburban corridors, making the area both pedestrian and transit friendly. Focus on issues of pedestrian mobility and accessibility, and public transit with the "visioning" and recommendations providing planning directions to local agencies and private enterprises to retrofit the existing auto-dominated environment.

12: Lansing/Tri-County Region: “Regional Growth: Choices For Our Future” \$355,000

The Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, representing Clinton, Eaton and Ingham Counties and the Lansing, Michigan metropolitan area, has initiated Regional Growth: Choices For Our Future to Develop a series of innovative pilot planning techniques which will demonstrate enhanced planning methods which may be readily transferred to similar efforts nationwide. Formulate consensus on a new land use patterns and on new policies to guide land use change. Evaluate and track successful implementation by creating a "Sprawl Index" and a comprehensive evaluation program using real cost studies and fiscal impact analysis, analysis of how transportation investment decisions and asset management strategies effect urban sprawl, gathering information on why people relocate, and developing monitoring measures.

Missouri

06: Kansas City Metropolitan Area: “SMART CHOICES-Options for Creating Quality Places” \$600,000

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC), project will build on regional and local planning efforts addressing the better integration of transportation investments and land use decisions. Provide tools specifically designed for Midwestern communities to promote urban and suburban development compatible with sustainable community design. Activities include: (1) the development of Transit-Oriented Development prototypes, education, and other implementation

strategies; (2) a cost-of- development analysis that will provide fiscal information relative to alternative development; and, (3) an interactive compact disc to communicate information on alternative design concepts and specifications.

Montana

06: City of Laurel: “Transportation and Community Sustainability Plan” \$85,000

Develop a 'Transportation and Community Sustainability Plan' for the City of Laurel. Activities include: (1) analyzing the traffic and community impacts of major transportation features; (2) analyzing the overall transportation system (current and planned) and its implications for sustainability; (3) analyzing the land use patterns and their contributions to the traffic situation; (4) analyzing the sustainability of the community’s commercial core in the face of transportation-related threats; (5) analyzing non-motorized travel; (6) analyzing how different assumptions in transportation and land use can lead to more sustainable scenarios for the future; and (7) creating an action plan for a more sustainable Laurel.

New Jersey

14: Northern New Jersey: “Preparing Modern Intermodal Freight Infrastructure to Support Brownfield Economic Redevelopment” \$700,000

Facilitate the redevelopment of abandoned industrial brownfield sites by freight related businesses at the port, airport, and rail terminals in northern New Jersey. Leverage statewide and regional resources to overcome current constraints affecting brownfield redevelopment. Conduct a market analysis, compile an inventory of promising brownfield sites, perform outreach to communities and carry out detailed case studies. Completed plan will address needed transportation access to brownfield sites and effectively market the sites for freight related activities and provide new employment opportunities for urban residents, avert inefficient sprawl, reduce the volume of trucks on regional roads and safeguard the environment.

34: State of New Jersey: “Transit-friendly Communities for New Jersey” \$535,000

Work with diverse community partners to develop specific ways that New Jersey towns can become more “transit friendly,” by building on both NJT’s initiatives to make train stations themselves “passenger friendly” and on statewide “smart growth” initiatives to reduce sprawl and encourage new development within walking distance of transit stations. Develop educational workshops, technical assistance and demonstration projects in four to six communities to shape a new vision for linking train stations to community enhancement. Implement a series of short-term, catalytic demonstration projects in the districts immediately around train stations to spur community involvement and leverage local investment and participation. Maximize its relevancy to the state’s diverse community involvement and leverage local investment and participation. Leverage the talents and resources of NJT’s non-profit and government partners to shape the future of communities around NJT stations well into the 21st Century. Develop models for other New Jersey communities to follow in future NJT projects. Ensure that communities understand how transportation investments can enhance the environment, create strong downtown centers, and improve quality of life.

New York

02: City of Troy: “Waterfront Redevelopment” \$70,000

Develop a Transportation and Land Use Study as a part of a redevelopment planning process for South Troy's Working Waterfront. Address the needs of this long underutilized waterfront and facilitate the area's development as an appealing and efficient business, residential, cultural, and recreational center. Inventory and analyze the existing land use pattern and transportation system, evaluate redevelopment alternatives, and identify and implement a series of compatible land use and transportation strategies and projects for the study area. Combine planning techniques including community workshops and visioning sessions, design charrettes, and planning and architecture student involvement. Build upon collaborative working relationships with traditional and nontraditional partners including community-based, organizations and nonprofit agencies, as

well as private, public, local, regional, County and State agency representatives. Develop a plan to maximize efficiency in transportation access while minimizing environmental and related impacts of the proposed redevelopment.

North Carolina

06: Research Triangle Region: “Regional Development & Mobility Principles” \$450,000

Develop strategies to change the 6-county Research Triangle region's current pattern of development from a conventional suburban expansion model to one based more on principles supportive of compact urban form with walkable. Activities include: A detailed description and analysis comparing the land use, transportation, fiscal and environmental implications of the preferred regional development pattern to the current development pattern. A comprehensive set of strategies composed of design and development standards, infrastructure policies, fiscal tools, and legislative authority needed to achieve the preferred development pattern. A set of computer visualizations and supporting explanatory material showing how places within the region could develop differently under the preferred pattern or under the current pattern. A community outreach and feedback effort to explain the project's work, monitor communities' views of the work, and revise the work to address community concerns.

Ohio

10: Woodmere Village, Cleveland: Making Chagrin Boulevard a “Place” Instead of a Dividing Road: A Greater Cleveland Demonstration Project in Woodmere Village, Ohio” \$195,000

Redefining Woodmere Village, a small, predominantly African-American suburb of Cleveland, in a highly creative manner. Create an environment for small town community interactions while simultaneously handling 26,000-36,000 ADT on its "Main Street." Provide a local demonstration project which balances the interests of "home," "place" and business with the goal of commuter convenience. Set the stage to adopt new zoning and land use policies to encourage denser, more

sustainable development in the future.

12: City of Dayton: “Tool Town” \$300,000

Evaluate the existing buildings, transportation infrastructure, and utilities and the development of a schematic campus master plan with capital costs, an implementation schedule, and funding strategies. Tool Town will make more efficient use of existing transportation network and other infrastructure and reuse land and the built environment, both of which will curb additional regional sprawl. The effort will also create jobs that can be filled by Dayton residents; support the long-term viability of tooling and machining in our region; help tooling and machining industry compete globally; and retain these secure, high-paying jobs in the United States.

Oregon

**05: Portland Metropolitan Area: “Urban Reserve Planning for the Portland, Oregon
\$500,000**

Develop master planning for the area must occur before development begins to ensure efficient provision of services and infrastructure and effective environmental conservation. Help local governments address the difficult transportation, land-use and environmental challenges of the area, including: Streams on the recent federal listing of endangered fish; Mitigation of addition impacts on severe downstream flooding; Local topography that creates a serious challenge in transitioning from a few two-lane country roads to a system that can serve the expected future population.

**11: Willamette Valley: “Evaluate the Transportation Impacts of Possible Futures in
Oregon's Willamette Valley Organization” \$600,000**

Provide a unique, long-range, regional focus on: (1) the transportation consequences of continuing current land development patterns in the Valley; (2) the benefits possible through alternative, transportation-efficient development patterns that are based on more compact growth and urban designs that reduce reliance on the automobile; and (3) the benefits possible through

certain changes in the transportation system. Focus on all current and future travel between the metropolitan areas, cities and towns in the 11,500 square mile Valley. Activities include: (1) the development, modeling and analysis of possible future land use and transportation scenarios; (2) public outreach and education; (3) development of recommended actions and implementation strategies to achieve a preferred future; and (4) development of regional benchmarks and a monitoring framework to track progress.

Pennsylvania

05: Centre County: "Creating a Community-based Sustainable Future for I-99: A Watershed Approach" \$500,000

Establish a collaborative, multi-municipal model interchange overlay district ordinance to better manage and guide development surrounding the 12 interchanges in Centre County of I-99 in Centre County and create a watershed-wide (mid-Bald Eagle watershed including the Spring Creek Basin), community-based collaborative land use and sustainability plan to meet the long-term needs of the community.

08: Philadelphia Metropolitan Area: "Implement Transit Oriented Development in the Philadelphia Metropolitan Area: Schuylkill Valley Metro (SVM) Corridor Station Area Planning and Implementation" \$665,600

Implement TOD principles and induce private sector investment in TODs by: (1) creating an innovative LEM Product that provides mortgage financing for housing in transit dense areas, (2) undertaking a region wide advocacy project to sow the seeds of public support for TODs, (3) producing a transit corridor-specific real estate market demand feasibility study that provide a greater level of understanding of TODs within the real estate community (thereby reducing the perceived risk to developers) and (4) preparing zoning ordinance language, to implement focused station area plans, that provides a supportive regulatory environment for TOD. Innovative activities include: (1) the proposed LEM Product; (2) the timing of the planning and development

regulations work and garnering public support for TOD, well in advance of implementing a major transportation investment; and (3) basing the development controls on a corridor and station-focused real estate market study.

Rhode Island

11: City of Providence: “Olneyville Square Inter-modal Transit Center” \$600,000

Revitalize neighborhood by using transportation and intermodal facilities that will capitalize on an urban river, recycle brownfields, promote home-ownership and support small business development. Focus on the commercial heart of the neighborhood, which was once the second largest commercial area in the City, by: siting a public Transit Center, linking the Woonasquatucket Greenway/Bikeway project to the Transit Center, and re-connecting Olneyville Square and the Transit Center to the West Broadway neighborhood.

South Carolina

01: Berkeley, Charleston, Dorchester Region: “Development and implementation of a Model Program Strategy to Link Transportation, Infrastructure and Land Use Planning for the Berkeley Charleston Dorchester Region of South Carolina” \$300,000

Evaluate past and future growth patterns and promote sustainable growth in the Berkeley, Charleston, and Dorchester region, the Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester Council of Governments (BCDCOG). Utilize satellite imagery to graphically depict growth patterns over twenty years in the region and using the identified patterns to project impacts for the future. Estimate the costs of sprawl. Evaluate environmental losses of growth patterns at the continued rate and pattern. Compile alternative land use and growth pattern strategies and the identify techniques to encourage organized and sustainable growth. Illustrate the impacts and costs (in environmental losses as well as fiscal impacts) of particular growth patterns as experienced in the past twenty years, as well as to project those same impacts and costs if a similar pattern of growth is continued. Develop alternatives and recommendations to encourage smarter and more efficient

growth.

Tennessee

01: Johnson City: “The Land Use and Transportation Plan” \$275,000

Integrate land use planning with transportation planning to increase the performance and efficiency of the transportation system. Adopted formal code changes to land use regulations based on the principles of traditional neighborhood development and transit oriented development. Create opportunities for intensified mixed-use development to occur in neighborhood nodes and permit increased accessibility for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit. Evaluate projected traffic volume and type with and without adoption of the new regulations. The results of the Land Use and Transportation will be able to be used by other communities across the State of Tennessee and nationally.

Texas

14: City of Houston: “Main Street Corridor Planning and Research Project” \$500,000

Develop a singular, urban vision for the eight-mile Main Street Corridor. Encourage transit and pedestrian-oriented development, improve access to the corridor, explore ground-breaking implementation strategies, and institute innovative evaluation techniques. Build partnerships among public agencies, private and non-profit interests as a vital component of the planning process. Reinforce trends toward inner city revitalization leading to a reduction of automobile dependency and improved air quality in the region.

Utah

07: Greater Wasatch Area: “Envision Utah” \$425,000

Create a broadly and publicly supported Quality Growth Strategy-a vision to protect Utah's environment, economic strength, and quality of life for our children. Create a replicable process for planning and managing rapid growth and development. Seek community feedback and participation to assist in the development of a publicly supported Quality Growth Strategy and

pursuit of actual implementation of this strategy in the Greater Wasatch Area. Develop and draft final Quality Growth Strategy and pursue actual implementation of this strategy in the Greater Wasatch Area. Utilize modeling tools to assist Envision Utah in the cost and impact analysis of the alternative growth scenarios.

Virginia

03: Charlottesville Metropolitan Area: “Jefferson Area Eastern Planning Initiative”

\$517,920

Develop a new model for integrated land use/transportation planning and use it to achieve a regional plan which lays the groundwork for the community's 50-year vision. Build upon planning tools the PDC has developed to improve the multi-modal design of neighborhoods, commercial centers, and transportation corridors. Package as a handbook, CD-Rom, and on the Web to make it easy for other small urban and rural communities to use them.

Washington

02: Central Puget Sound Region: “Transit Station Communities Project ” \$400,000

Use a variety of tools that will contribute to the success of intermodal facilities by working with citizens, neighborhood groups, the business sector, developers, elected officials, and agency personnel to create more livable communities. Organize and initiate both region wide coordination as well as local technical assistance efforts. Coordinate the numerous and disparate station area planning and development activities throughout the region to reach out to local jurisdictions, the development community, and the public to increase the level of awareness and understanding of the opportunities and challenges of intermodal station planning. Provide direct technical assistance and improve community outreach and test a variety of different techniques aimed at advancing local implementation and expanding local community participation.

West Virginia

01: City of Martinsburg: “Historic Baltimore & Ohio Roundhouse Renovation Project”

\$300,000

Develop plans and specifications to renovate/restore the Historic B&O Roundhouse complex. Establish an intermodal operations center to coordinate these services in relation to port commerce, commuter systems, commercial trade, travel and tourism which ties together the highway, rail and air transportation system from within the inland intermodal port area to the historic infrastructure links in a manner which will enhance commerce, cultural/recreational opportunities, and transportation best practices. Develop a Facility Use Plan to chart the course for the complex's development. Provide direction for local officials and the community as they strive to both preserve and effectively transform the existing facility into a key element of the entire transportation, retail trade and community complex. Purchase a trolley bus which will be used as a key short term commuter link with the existing transportation system by providing access to the MARC Train and the Pan Tran Public Transportation System.

Wisconsin

01: Dane County: "Design Dane Phase II" \$365,000

Provide Dane County communities with the tools necessary to thoroughly evaluate competing land development scenarios. Design a technical geographic model, standards, and process to more efficiently present to decision makers the true costs and benefits of alternative growth patterns. Consider alternatives to simply adding more lanes when making improvements to congested roadways. Coordinate between land use and transportation decision making in communities along roadway corridors. Design and implement transit-oriented development (TOD) projects that may be used as models for future development within our primary transit corridor.

ATTACHMENT II: Sample Outline and Format for FY 2000 TCSP Grant

Requests:

COVER SHEET with ABSTRACT (1 page)

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title And Location:

Agency:

Key Contact:

Address:

Phone/Fax/E-mail:

Amount Requested: \$_____

Abstract:

This should be a brief paragraph describing the project and the expected results. Describe the scale of activity such as rural, urban, statewide, etc. and provide information on the types of populations affected by the project (i.e., size of population, commuter, disadvantaged, minority, etc.).

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Narrative: Briefly describe the project, the geographic scale of the proposed activity (system, region, corridor, etc.), its expected results in the short- and longer-term (20-40 years), and the applicant's expectations or vision for the ultimate impact of the activity.

III. PURPOSE AND CRITERIA

Objectives: Further describe the project and its objectives. Relate how it furthers and integrates each of the following purposes of the TCSP program:

1. Improve the efficiency of the transportation system;
2. Reduce the impacts of transportation on the environment;
3. Reduce the need for costly future investments in public infrastructure;
4. Ensure efficient access to jobs, services, and centers of trade; and
5. Examine development patterns and identify strategies to encourage

private sector development patterns which achieve the goals of the TCSP.

IV. CATEGORY OF GRANTEE

Grantees should determine if their agency is: (a) Just beginning community preservation practices in their area, or (b) If they have already implemented community preservation practices. Grantees in this later category should provide brief information on established community preservation practices within their community or jurisdiction.

V. COORDINATION

Indicate how the proposal is consistent with State and metropolitan planning processes and how the appropriate MPO or State Department of Transportation coordination will be demonstrated.

VI. PARTNERS

List, and briefly describe if necessary, the agencies, organizations, and companies participating in the activities or on the project team. Describe the role and functions of the non-traditional partners participating on the project team. Describe plans for involvement or education of the private and public sector.

VII. SCHEDULE

Provide a schedule to complete the major steps or milestones in the project. Include dates of major milestones for project activities, the evaluation and when written reports of the project activities will be submitted.

VIII. BUDGET and RESOURCES

This section should include a list all funding, both Federal and non-Federal, and in-kind resources for the project. Priority is given to

proposals that demonstrate a commitment of non-Federal resources.

Proposals should clearly describe use of in-kind and direct funding contributions and distinguish contributions that are made directly for the proposed projects from those made for other related activities.

The budget should include a list of the major costs by category for the project. This could include, for example, personnel costs, travel, services, project evaluation including any contract services, etc. The budget should also show how the TCSP funds and other matching funds are used for these activities. The budget may include the costs for travel for one representative of the project team to participate and present the status and results of the project at two national conferences.

IX. PROJECT EVALUATION PLAN

The FHWA has prepared guidance on the preparation of evaluation plans for TCSP. This will assist in preparing and summarizing the preliminary plans for evaluation of the activity, including means of monitoring, indicators and measures of performance, and plans for reporting results.

Copies of this guidance can be found on the FHWA website (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/program.html>) or from the FHWA's Division office in the applicant's State (see Attachment III):

Proposal format for submissions: This example format will assist applicants in preparing your proposal submission. The FHWA does not anticipate that these grant requests will be very lengthy (recommend no more than 15 pages). Any attachments that are included should be directly related to the proposal. Because the FHWA will make copies of the grant proposals for the review process, requests should be in a similar format:

General Format:

Page Size: 8 ½" x 11" (including maps and attachments)

12 point font, single sided

Clip the top left corner -- no binding or staples

Any colored documents (including maps) should be reproducible in black and white

Include on each page of your submission the project title and page number

Format for additional electronic submission (optional):

Electronic Format: Include proposal (without attachments) in WordPerfect version 6/7/8 or Word version 97 or earlier on 3 ½ inch floppy disk labeled with your project title and name.

No watermarks, embedded text, or graphics.

Project submission: Please submit 4 copies and an electronic file of the grant request to the FHWA's Division office in your State. The request should be in the Division office by **Thursday, July 15, 1999.**

ATTACHMENT III

FHWA DIVISION OFFICES

State	FHWA Address, Phone No.
Alabama	500 Eastern Boulevard, Suite 200, Montgomery, AL 36117-2018, 334-223-7374
Alaska	P.O. Box 21648, Juneau, AK 99802-1648, 907-586-7180
Arizona	234 N. Central Avenue, Suite 330, Phoenix, AZ 85004, 602-379-3916
Arkansas	Federal Office Building, 700 West Capitol Avenue, Room 3130, Little Rock, AR 72201-3298, 501-324-5625
California	980 9th Street, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95814-2724, 916-498-5015
Colorado	555 Zang Street, Room 250, Lakewood, CO 80228-1097, 303-969-6730, Ext. 371

Connecticut 628-2 Hebron Avenue, Suite 303, Glastonbury, CT 06033-5007, 860-659-6703,
Ext. 3008

Delaware 300 South New Street, Room 2101, Dover, DE 19904-6726, 302-734-3819
District of Columbia Unio5555enter Plaza, 820 First Street, N.E., Suite 750, Washington, DC 20002
202-523-0163

Florida 227 North Bronough Street, Room 2015, Tallahassee, FL 32301, 850-942-9586

Georgia 61 Forsyth St., SW, 17th Floor, Suite 17T100, Atlanta, GA 30303-3104, 404-562-3630

Hawaii 300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Suite 3202, Box 50206, Honolulu, HI 96850, 808-541-2531

Idaho 3050 Lakeharbor Lane, Suite 126, Boise 83703, 208-334-9180, Ext. 119

Illinois 3250 Executive Park Drive, Springfield, IL 62703-4514, 217-492-4641

Indiana Federal Office Building, Room 254, 575 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, IN
46204-1576, 317-226-7475

Iowa 105 6th Street, P.O. Box 627, Ames, IA 50010-6337, 515-233-7302

Kansas 3300 South Topeka Blvd., Suite 1, Topeka, KS 66611-2237, 785-267-7281

Kentucky John C. Watts Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse , 330 West Broadway Street,
P.O. Box 536, Frankfort, KY 40602, 502-223-6723

Louisiana Federal Building, Room 255, 750 Florida St., Room 255, P.O. Box 3929,
Baton Rouge, LA 70801, 225-389-0245

Maine Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building, 40 Western Avenue, Room 614,
Augusta, ME 04330, 207-622-8487, Ext. 20

Maryland The Rotunda, Suite 220, 711 West 40th Street, Baltimore 21211-2187, 410-962-4342,
Ext. 124

Massachusetts Transportation Systems Center, 55 Broadway, 10th Floor, Cambridge 02142
617-494-3657

Michigan Federal Building, Room 207, 315 West Allegan Street, Lansing, MI 48933,
517-377-1844

Minnesota Galtier Plaza, Box 75, 175 East Fifth Street, Suite 500, St. Paul, MN 55101-2904,
651-291-6105

Mississippi 666 North Street, Suite 105, Jackson 39202-3199, 601-965-4223

Missouri 209 Adams Street, Jefferson City 65101, 573-636-7104

Montana 2880 Skyway Drive, Helena, MT 59602, 406-449-5303, Ext. 236

Nebraska Federal Building, Room 220, 100 Centennial Mall North, Lincoln, NE 69508-3851,
402-437-5521

Nevada 705 North Plaza Street, Suite 220, Carson City, NV 89701-0602, 775-687-5321

New Hampshire 279 Pleasant Street, Room 204, Concord, NH 03301-2509, 603-225-1606

New Jersey 840 Bear Tavern Road, Suite 310, West Trenton, NJ 08628-1019, 609-637-4200

New Mexico 604 W. San Mateo Road, Santa Fe, NM 87505, 505-820-2022

New York Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building, Clinton & N. Pearl Sts., 9th Floor, Albany, NY 12207,
518-431-4131

North Carolina 310 New Bern Avenue, Suite 410, Raleigh, NC 27601, 919-856-4347

North Dakota 1471 Interstate Loop, Bismarck, ND 58501-0567, 701-250-4347

Ohio 200 North High Street, Room 328, Columbus, OH 43215, 614-280-6896

Oklahoma 300 N. Meridian, Suite 105 S, Oklahoma City, OK 73107-6560. 405-605-6174

Oregon The Equitable Center, Suite 100, 530 Center St., N.E., Salem, OR 97301,
503-399-5749

Pennsylvania 228 Walnut Street, Room 558, Harrisburg 17101-1720, 717-221-4585

Puerto Rico Federico Degetau Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, Carlos Chardon St., Rm 329,
San Juan, PR 00918-1755, 787-766-5600, Ext. 230

Rhode Island 380 Westminster Mall, Fifth Floor, Providence, RI 02903, 401-528-4560

South Carolina Strom Thurmond Federal Building, 1835 Assembly Street, Suite 758,
Columbia, SC 29201, 803-765-5282

South Dakota The Sibley Building, 116 East Dakota Avenue, Pierre, SD 57501-3110,
605-224-7326, Ext. 3043

Tennessee 249 Cumberland Bend Drive, Nashville, TN 37228, 615-736-5394

Texas Federal Office Building, Room 826, 300 East Eighth Street, Austin , TX 78701,
512-916-5511

Utah 2520 W. 4700 South, Suite 9A, Salt Lake City, UT 84118, 801-963-0182

Vermont Federal Building, 87 State St., P.O. Box 568, Montpelier 05601, 802-828-4433

Virginia The Dale Building, Suite 205, 1504 Santa Rosa Road, Richmond 23229,
804-281-5103

Washington Suite 501, Evergreen Plaza, 711 South Capitol Way, Olympia, WA 98501,
360-753-9554

West Virginia Geary Plaza, Suite 200, 700 Washington Street. E, Charleston, WV 25301-1604
304-347-5929

Wisconsin Highpoint Office Park, 567 D'Onofrio Drive, Madison, WI 53719-2814, 608-829-7506

Wyoming 1916 Evans Avenue, Cheyenne, WY 82001-3764, 307-772-2004, Ext. 41

FHWA/FTA METROPOLITAN OFFICES

New York 6 World Trade Center, Room 320, New York, NY 10048, FAX: 212-466-1939
212-668-2201
26 Federal Plaza, Suite 2940, New York, NY 10278-0194, FAX 212-264-8973
212-668-2170

Philadelphia 1760 Market St., Suite 510, Philadelphia, Pa 19103, 215-656-7070,
FAX: 215-656-7260, 215-656-7111

Chicago 200 West Adams, Room 2410, Chicago, IL 60606, 312-886-1616, FAX 312-886-0351
312-886-1604

Los Angeles 201 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 1460, Los Angeles, CA 90012; 213-202-3950;

FAX: 213-202-3961

(**Authority:** 23 U.S.C. 315; sec. 1221, Pub.L. 105-178, 112 Stat. 107, 221 (1998); 49 CFR 1.48).

Issued on: May 3, 1999